



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,088	07/14/2003	Mark E. Steen	AMO0007	4690
30438 7590 11/13/2007 SMYRSKI LAW GROUP, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 3310 AIRPORT AVENUE, SW SANTA MONICA, CA 90405			EXAMINER KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER	
			ART UNIT 3763	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/619,088

Applicant(s)

STEEN ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher D. Koharski

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 77-86 and 109-148 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 77-86 and 109-148 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges the reply filed 8/27/2007 in which no claims were amended. Currently claims 77-86 and 109-148 are pending for examination in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 77 and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dotson, Jr. (4,274,411). Dotson, Jr. discloses a fluid operated ophthalmic irrigation and aspiration device.

Regarding claims 77 and 109, Dotson, Jr. discloses a fluid operated method and device for aspiration of the ocular region (see abstract) using modulated differential pressure pulses via a fluid control device (Figures 1-3) (col 1, ln 50-67) (col 5, ln 15-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 77, 80-86, 109, 112-116, 119, 122-125, 128, 130-134, 137-139, and 141-146 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bylsma (6,319,220) in view of Dotson, Jr. (4,274,411).

Regarding claims 77, 80-86, 109, 112-116, 119, 1212-125, 128, 130-134, 137-139, and 141-146, Bylsma discloses a method and device for aspirating fluid from an ocular region during a phacoemulsification procedure (cols 2, 30-70; col 3, ln 1-30) comprising aspirating (4) the ocular region a pressure system to the ocular region via fluid control device (10) while applying ultrasonic energy with a needle (34), capable of producing cavitation (Figures 7-9). Bylsma further discloses delivering modulated ultrasound (see Figures 6-7)(col 4, ln 10-40) using an ultrasound phacoemulsification hand piece (30) (Figure 1).

Bylsma meets the claim limitations as described above except for the specific fluid control device creating a pressure pulse system for aspiration.

However, Dotson, Jr. discloses a fluid operated ophthalmic irrigation and aspiration device.

Regarding claims 77, 80-86, 109, 112-116, 119, 122-125, 128, 132-134, 137-139, and 141-146, Dotson, Jr. discloses a fluid operated method and device for aspiration of the ocular region (see abstract) using modulated differential pressure pulses via a fluid control device (Figures 1-3) (col 1, ln 50-67) (col 5, ln 15-55).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the aspiration system of Dotson, Jr. with the system of Bylsma in order to provide a system that aids in the aspiration of hard to remove pieces of material (cols 1, ln 60-70) and the system of Dotson, Jr. is disclosed to be used with numerous types of hand piece systems (col 3, ln 1-20). The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Dotson, Jr. (cols 1-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 78-79, 85-86, 110-111, 117-118, 120-121, 126-127, 129-131, 135-136, 140-141 and 147-148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bylsma (6,319,220) in view of Dotson, Jr. (4,274,411)

The modified Bylsma discloses the claimed invention except for the specific modulation pulse duration (100 milliseconds, 8 milliseconds, and 25, milliseconds).

Regarding claims 78-79, 85-86, 110-111, 117-118, 120-121, 126-127, 129-131, 135-136, 140-141 and 147-148, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the duration values as claimed by Applicant since the values as claimed lack criticality for the specific pulse times and duration and since Dotsonm, Jr. discloses the duration and pulse amounts can be

varied to optimize removal of fragments (col 6, ln 20-60); additionally, it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). See Gonan (6,423,028) for a representative example illustrating varied pulse durations (Figures 1-10, col 4).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 8/27/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 77-86 and 109-148 under Bylsma (6,319,220) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made (see above).

Regarding Applicant's request for an affidavit of support for the 103(a) rejection in the prior office and the current action under C.F.R. § 1.104 (d)(2), is improper. Under C.F.R. § 1.104 (d)(2) the Examiner can be request that to provide an affidavit that supports to support a rejection of the claims based on the official notice, common knowledge, or personal knowledge of the Examiner, or provide a reference demonstrating the purported common knowledge. See *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344-45, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430, 1435 (Fed. Cir. 2002). As evidenced by the rejection the above, these criteria are not relied upon by the Examiner for the rejection above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Art Unit: 3763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date:

11/9/07



NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700



Christopher D. Koharski
AU 3763